

2021 EPP Annual Report - Reviewer Feedback (Staff Review Report)

Section 1 AIMS Profile & Section 2 Program Completers

Overview: These sections ask for a yearly update to the EPP's electronic profile information and number of completers to ensure relevant communication and actions from CAEP.

Why are these sections important? The assurance of accurate profile information (including confirming up to five points of contact, identifying EPP characteristics, and detailing programs offered) are crucial to CAEP being able to get in touch with you, as well as being aware of EPP characteristics for research and site team assignment purposes, and accurate scrutiny of disaggregated data from relevant programs by Program Reviewers and/or site visitors and Accreditation Councilors. Additionally, completer counts are important to accurate billing for accreditation activities.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✓ **CAEP asks for current listings of contact persons** due to potential turnover at the EPP that may prevent the most relevant individuals from receiving essential information. As the contact information confirmed in the EPP Annual Report is used for official accreditation-related communications, the EPP should take the opportunity to list up to two "EPP Heads" and up to three "CAEP Coordinators" to facilitate a consistent flow of information to appropriate individuals. Individual identified "EPP Head" should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP. The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in managing accreditation activities and may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.

✓ **CAEP asks for current EPP Characteristics** to generate official accreditation documents, provide context for site visitors and Accreditation Councilors, allow for disaggregation of information by relevant demographics for research purposes, and ensuring adequate representation in formal and informal feedback efforts.

- **Basic Information.** This section includes information that CAEP uses to generate official accreditation documents, including mailing address and EPP name.

- **EPP Characteristics and Affiliations.** This section provides contextual information for better understanding the EPP and its work including types of licensure/degree programs at the initial-teacher licensure and/or advanced-level, EPP type consistent with Carnegie Classification, Professional Development School levels, Religious affiliation, admissions test(s), language of instruction, teaching majors, institutional/regional accreditation, institutional memberships, and off campus/branch campus(es)/distance learning/alternative certification programs.

✓ **CAEP asks for current EPP Program Listings** to ensure current information for all programs offered by the EPP that fall within CAEP's scope, as well as those covered by current NCATE or TEAC accreditation. Please review, update, and/or add each Program Name, Level, Certificate Level for Degree(s), and Program Category Fields.

✓ **CAEP asks for current EPP Program Completers** to generate accurate billing information, as the CAEP Annual Fee structure is based on the number of completers - for both initial-licensure and advanced-level programs - and scaled to support smaller EPPs.

1. [1.1] Is at least one individual listed for each available contact identity - EPP head and CAEP Coordinator - with email addresses that appear valid?

Yes No

2. [1.1 & 1.2] Based on information from the EPP's Information Page, Program Options page, EPP's link to its approved programs (as indicated in Section 1.2 of the EPP Annual Report), are there any apparent discrepancies?

Yes No

SPA National Recognition status is granted for seven years. However, an error in the expiration date for the Elementary Ed program has been noticed. The program, which were reviewed in fall 2016, should have a National Recognition status expiring on 2/1/2024, but it states 2/1/2026. The error will be fixed in AIMS to show the accurate expiration date. Feel free to contact CAEP staff at eppannualreport@caepnet.org for any clarifications regarding the above.

3. [2.1] Comparing the EPP's completer numbers from last year to this year, is there a discrepancy which may indicate a mistake?

Yes No

Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/mission-vision/>

i. Does the above link listing accredited Initial and Advanced Programs work?

Yes No

ii. Does the list of Initial and/or Advance programs identified as reviewed and accredited by CAEP

match the programs reviewed in the last accreditation cycle?

Yes No

iii. If not, identify programs outside of the scope of CAEP's (or NCATE or TEAC) previous review.

In Section 1.2 of the annual report, the EPP provides a link to its website; however, the information does not clearly demonstrate which Initial and/or Advanced Programs were part of the last accreditation review. Please update the webpage and send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email (eppannualreport@caepnet.org) by October 25, 2021.

Section 3 Substantive Changes

Overview: If a substantive change occurred during the Academic Year of the present EPP Annual Report through the date of the submission of this report, the EPP should provide an explanation. The explanation should provide CAEP with information about the nature of the change, a rationale for the change, an implementation timeline, and other any other essential information. Substantive changes to be reported include changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP; in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP; addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited; addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited; a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements; that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirement; in regional accreditation status; or in state program approval.

Why is this section important? Advising CAEP of substantive changes is one of the actions that must be taken to maintain accreditation or eligibility. Changes are reviewed to determine effects, if any, to accreditation status.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✓ CAEP, in accordance with Federal regulation (34 CFR Part 602 Subpart B (§602.22)), requires an EPP to inform CAEP of any changes to the educational mission, program, or programs of the EPP which may adversely affect the capacity of the EPP to continue to meet CAEP's standards. These changes must be communicated as part of the Annual Report or in a separate communication to the CAEP President, addressed to president@caepnet.org or the current mailing address for the organization. CAEP has the responsibility to determine what effect, if any, substantive changes would have on an EPP's accreditation

1. [3.2] Did the EPP indicate any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP?
 Yes No
2. [3.6] Did the EPP indicate changes in its regional/institutional accreditation status?
 Yes No
3. [3.7] Did the EPP indicate changes in its state approval status?
 Yes No

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Overview: CAEP re-worked its approach to the Annual Reporting Measures. Instead of requesting data via a series of questions and CAEP-created standardized tables, CAEP has aligned its approach to CAEP Standards 4 and 5. In Section 4 of the 2018 EPP Annual Report, the provider is asked to publicly display data, pertaining to each of the Annual Reporting Measures (four of these measures are impact measures matching the four components of the CAEP Standard 4 for Initial-Licensure Programs and two of these match the two components of CAEP Standard 4 for Advanced-Level Programs), on the its website. This approach respects an EPP's context by allowing context-specific data collection and hosting in a manner of the EPP's choice, as long as the presented data are appropriate measures and are accurate.

Why is this section important? Having accreditation standards and policies that require EPPs "to routinely provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement," is central to maintaining CAEP's CHEA recognition, CAEP's role as an accreditor, and EPP's demonstration of accountability to stakeholders and provision of transparent information to potential candidates.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✓ The requirement to widely disseminate and display the Annual Reporting Measures is located in Components 5.4 and A.5.4 of the CAEP Standards and a part of CAEP Policy (Policies 6.01, on Annual Reporting, and 8.01, on Consumer Information). EPPs accredited under the NCATE standards or TEAC quality principles were required to publicly display candidate performance data in previous EPP Annual Report years. The updated Section 4 includes and builds from that approach by including the Annual Reporting Measures. In alignment with Component 5.4, providers are also asked to summarize the data and trends represented in the provider's Annual Reporting Measures, which allows EPPs to prepare for writing a self-study report and to use the EPP Annual Report as a

repository and source for working toward Component 5.4. Site visitors and Accreditation Councilors review EPP Annual Report submissions in evaluating your EPP's evidence toward Component 5.4. Annual Report Reviewers flag exemplars of best practices of displaying these data to enhance the tips and exemplars to be included in next year's EPP Annual Report Technical Guide.

1. [4.1] Review Section 4 links

a. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/impact-on-student-learning/>

i. Does the above link work?

Yes No

ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

No data are provided.

iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?

Yes No

iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data for measure 1 are not provided.

b. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/case-study/>

i. Does the above link work?

Yes No

ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?

Yes No

iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?

Yes No

iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?

Yes No

c. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/teaching-effectiveness/>

i. Does the above link work?

Yes No

ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?

Yes No

iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?

Yes No

iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?

Yes No

d. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/employer-satisfaction/>

i. Does the above link work?

Yes No

ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

No data is provided for measure 3

iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?

Yes No

iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

No data is provided for measure 3

e. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/completer-satisfaction/>

- i. Does the above link work?
 Yes No
- ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?
 Yes No
- iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?
 Yes No
- iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?
 Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data needs to be updated to reflect AY 2019-2020

f. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/hiring-oportunities/>

- i. Does the above link work?
 Yes No
- ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?
 Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data for measure 7 were not provided.

- iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?
 Yes No
- iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?
 Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data for measure 7 were not provided.

g. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/graduation-rates/>

- i. Does the above link work?
 Yes No
- ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?
 Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data for measure 5 was not provided

- iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?
 Yes No
- iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?
 Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data for measure 5 was not provided.

h. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/loan-default-rates/>

- i. Does the above link work?
 Yes No
- ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?
 Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data was not presented for measure 8

iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?

Yes No

iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data was not presented for measure 8

i. Link: <http://ppm.uprag.edu/candidate-electronic-portfolios/>

i. Does the above link work?

Yes No

ii. Are data publicly/prominently displayed?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data provided is not relate to any of the 8 annual reporting measures.

iii. Are measures displayed but not tagged?

Yes No

iv. Are data relative to measure number(s) indicated appropriate?

Yes No

If no, please summarize issue.

Data provided is not relate to any of the 8 annual reporting measures.

2. [4.1] Are any measures missing across link(s) provided that should be present, according to the EPP's indication of offering program(s) leading to initial-teacher licensure and/or advanced-level programs [1.1 & 2.1]?

Yes No

If yes, please summarize issue.

Reviewers could not locate appropriate and/or updated data for CAEP's Annual Reporting Measures #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 using the EPP's link above. To ensure compliance with CAEP requirements, the EPP needs to update and prominently display the information on its own website with complete data for the missing annual reporting measures, as collected from academic year 2019-20. If the information is currently not accessible for any specific measure, the EPP needs to clearly specify on the website a rationale for the gap and provide a timeline for when it will be shared with public. Please review the 2021 Annual Report Technical Guide to understand the expectations and best practices for reporting the annual measures, address the issues stated above, and send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email (eppannualreport@caepnet.org) by October 25, 2021. NOTE: Please provide a single link to the EPP's website where information on all the eight measures could be located. Please refer to the Technical Guide available here: <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/epp-annual-report-technical-guide-final.pdf?la=en>

3. Is display of data an example of best practice?

Yes No

4. [4.2] Does EPP narrative sufficiently address all question prompts?

Yes No

4.a. If no, which prompts are not sufficiently addressed?

- Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends?
- Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?
- Are benchmarks available for comparison?
- Are measures widely shared?
- How are measures widely shared?
- With whom are measures shared?
- Overall, what have you learned about the EPP's performance on these outcome and impact measures?
- Specify:

4.b. Further clarification (optional)

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Overview: This section asks EPPs to report on progress correcting any Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations cited during the most recent accreditation site visit.

Why is this section important? Any citations earned by EPPs at the most recent accreditation visit represent parts of accreditation standards or principles that were not demonstrated sufficiently according to expectations represented by such a designation. Therefore, rectifying these deficiencies is essential to the quality of the EPP and the integrity of accreditation. This section allows for the EPP's annual reflection on progress -looking toward addressing gaps sufficiently within the required time - and CAEP's monitoring of the EPP during the accreditation cycle between in-depth self-study submissions.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

- ✓ Accreditation is a check on work EPPs do daily - not just every seven years. Therefore, CAEP's role as an accreditor, in general and as part of being recognized by CHEA, includes monitoring EPPs between site visits, particularly when accreditation standards were not fully met. Under CAEP, Areas for Improvement describe a weakness in evidence for a CAEP Standard and/or component that should be remediated by the end of the accreditation term, while Stipulations describe one or more systemic concerns or serious deficiencies in evidence for a CAEP Standard and/or component that must be remedied to continue accreditation. Accordingly, this section allows EPPs and CAEP to check-in on progress to prompt EPPs to hopefully have fully corrected any deficiencies by the time of the next review, if not sooner as these represent aspects of EPP's program(s) that hinder ensuring development of effective candidates to meet the needs of P-12 students. Further, EPP Annual Report Reviewers review progress and offer prompts, as appropriate to steer EPPs in productive direction.

1

CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to 3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP did not provide a written recruitment plan to document evidence and results. (component 3.1)

The Educator Preparation Program is keen to recruit diverse and academically talented students interested in the future of Education in Puerto Rico and abroad. It is understood that our student body's diversity also includes their language mastery (primarily Spanish and/or English), as well as educational and socio-economic backgrounds. All these factors compose our students' profiles as candidates in the Educator Preparation Program (PPM UPRAg). The Office of Planning and Institutional Research (OPEI) at the University of Puerto Rico in Aguadilla publishes a "Department Dashboard" once a year for each academic program as part of our Middle States required Fact Book. This document includes candidate freshmen enrollment, race, and ethnicity. In addition, it provides charts for each program's retention and graduation rates with comparisons against the previous two years. For the purposes stated in this plan, it is imperative to look at this data and study how the numbers have changed in the last few years. To accomplish this the data from both Department Dashboards—Education and English—have been combined as one. The College Board Entrance Aptitude Exam along with the student's overall high school grade point average (GPA) is used to calculate the minimum admission index (IGS) which each program offered by the university uses for selectivity. Candidate acceptance depends on an admission index of 2.30 or above. Graphed here (3.1.1 Recruitment Plan) are the exams' results showing three recent and consecutive academic years beginning in 2016-2017 to 2018-2019. The highest score achievable in each of the components of this aptitude test is 800 points. Coincidentally, the freshmen enrolled in the PPM UPRAg show higher scores in the English aptitude section on all three years, followed by the Verbal and Mathematical aptitude sections. Our current recruitment efforts are geared towards attracting more students from specialized and high-performing schools that wish to complete any of the PPM UPRAg available degrees. We are also promoting our education core courses as alternatives for students enrolled in other programs who may want to pursue educator certification as well as their chosen field of study. The chart below shows the number of incoming students, as a result of transfers, reclassifications, and readmissions, to the PPM UPRAg's Education in English degrees throughout four consecutive academic years beginning in 2016-2017. When compared to the number of freshmen students, the majority of our students join us after taking English and education courses required for their originally enrolled programs. Although most of our students are from western Puerto Rico, we have students from all regions of the island except the east. This indicates that there is an interest to enroll in the PPM UPRAg from students of neighboring towns and regions. Efforts to expand the reach of the program may translate into an increase in enrollment from these regions.

Recruitment Focus

1. High School/college-bound students
2. New transfer students
3. Reclassifications from other programs
4. Other majors seeking teaching licensing
5. In-service educators seeking to pursue additional certifications.

Short-Term Goals

1. To diversify the candidate pool and extend the geographic reach of our program.
2. To recruit high-quality candidates with high academic achievement and ability from diverse populations.

Long-Term Goals

1. To increase the freshmen enrollment by 10% every academic year, thus increasing the number of candidates in our program to an approximate ±170 candidates by 2025-2026.
2. To impress upon future candidates, the need for qualified teachers locally, nationally, and abroad in difficult

recruitment areas such as ESL and Online Education.

3. To interest non-teaching bachelor's degree majors who are interested in pursuing k-12 teaching licensing.

4. To reach a larger pool of students by extending our online offerings to include teaching computer languages and coding.

RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES

1. Coordinate and schedule school visits and participation in career fairs to share the pertinence of our offerings.

2. Brochures, flyers, video clips, etc. (3.1.2-4)

3. Share information concerning program admission requirements with a wider range of high schools—during visits and on the program website.

4. Open House - Invite talented, college-bound high school students to officially take college courses through the University of Puerto Rico's Early College Experience Program or to visit campus and attend program classes.

5. Contact high schools throughout the island and share information about workshops for students—via a newsletter featured on the program website.

6. QR Codes, Website, Blog, and Vlog.

7. Future Educators University Association (AUFE).

8. Deploy an online, social media, and email campaign to widely promote the functions sponsored by the program and/or its Future Educators Association.

9. Enlist the collaboration of the PPM UPRAg Alumni Association to spread the word about our program and to get us into their schools.

10. Establish a mentorship program through social media, in conjunction with the Alumni Association.

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?

How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

How are you monitoring and measuring progress?

How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?

How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)

What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

How does this effort complement existing initiatives?

How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?

Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?

How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?

If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) related to 4 Program Impact

The EPP has limited evidence of a plan to measure indicators of teaching effectiveness for its completers. (component 4.2)

Component 4 highlights how the program prepared the completers to be successful in their employment. Specifically, it focuses on the impact that the completers have on P-12 student learning and development. This component also evaluates the satisfaction of employers as well as completer satisfaction with the program. To demonstrate our program's effectiveness in these areas, we have designed a case study (4.2.1 Case Study) that uses multiple measures to assess the completer's success.

1. Design steps
2. Purpose of the study
3. Preparation of data collecting instruments
4. Identification of participants
5. Collection of data
6. Triangulation of data
7. Analysis of the results

Case studies are tools that institutions use to evaluate the effectiveness of their program. According to Balbach (1999), case studies are "particularly useful for evaluating unique programs, programs with unique outcomes, and programs carried out in turbulent or unpredictable environments" (4). PPM UPRAg is a unique program because it is the only one in Puerto Rico that specifically trains completers in educational technology integration. In Addition, the program has unique outcomes because it serves an almost exclusive Latinx population. These factors, coupled with the unique environment that Puerto Rico faced over the past few years (hurricanes, earthquakes, and the pandemic), make a case study the perfect tool for our EPP to use in this endeavor. Like the one presented here, case studies lend themselves well to program evaluation because they provide a comprehensive and holistic snapshot of how the program influences the completers, the stakeholders, and the students. Ultimately, "case studies enable a researcher to gain a more detailed, unbiased understanding of a complex situation, through the use of a range of research tools" (Salmon 2017). Our goal is to use the results of this case study to improve and assure the quality of the program.

The pilot case study will address four principal research questions:

1. What is the impact of PPM UPRAg preparation on completers' P-12 students learning and development?
2. How satisfied are P-12 students with the completer's teaching?
3. How satisfied are PPM UPRAg completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation?
4. How satisfied are the employers with the relevance and effectiveness of PPM UPRAg completers preparation?

Data Collection: Since 2017, the university has faced several unique challenges due to power outages, school closings due to the weather and environment, and the transition to distance learning at the beginning of 2020. Due to these circumstances, data collection has been our biggest obstacle.

The program has several schools in the Western area that frequently employ completers. PPM UPRAg reached out to these and one school entered into a partnership with our institution. The partnership school-provided data on their teachers, who are our completers, and their students. PPM UPRAg will continue to work harder on forging partnerships with other schools that recruit our completers as the pandemic restrictions are lifted.

Four instruments were used for data collection in relation to the research questions:

1. To examine the impact that PPM UPRAg completers have on their student's learning and development, a teaching observation instrument will be used. The instrument used for this measure is called the "Online Education Teacher Evaluation." During the pilot study phase, the data set came from seven completers. Additionally, the partnership school provided these completers' students' grades.
2. To determine how satisfied P-12 students are with the completer's teaching, a Student Satisfaction Survey was created and will continue to be used in future case studies.
3. To determine how satisfied completers are with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation, we employed the use of a Completer Survey. A sample of twenty-six completers who graduated from 2015-2019 completed the survey.
4. An employer's satisfaction survey was used to determine how satisfied employers are with the relevance and effectiveness of the completers and their preparation.

Participants: The Department of Education of Puerto Rico does not publish standardized test scores or statistics of any kind that relate to student learning. Because of this, we attempted to get participants from different private schools and grade levels. However, the situations that Puerto Rico faced from 2017 to the present made it challenging to collect a large amount of data. Ultimately, the data gathered comes from the partnership school. These completers graduated between 2015-2018.

Method: The data were collected during the 2020-2021 academic year due to the many hardships that completers have faced consecutively since 2017. The partnership school was contacted digitally because Puerto Rico was in lockdown since March 2020 due to the pandemic.

The data-gathering phase of the case study was conducted by the faculty and stakeholders of the PPM UPRAg program. In the initial phases, each CAEP standard was assigned to faculty-driven committees that shifted and regrouped as time went on to attend specific tasks related to the specific strands within each standard. Results: Overall, the results of this pilot case study show favorable results. For three out of four research questions, the data points to the fact that the program was instrumental for completer success. Not only were the completers satisfied with the program, but the administrators and students were as well.

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

How are you engaging stakeholders (P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers) in

this work?

- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?
- How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

- How are you monitoring and measuring progress?
- How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

- How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?
- How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)
- What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

- How does this effort complement existing initiatives?
- How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?
- Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?
- How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

- How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?
- If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?
- If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

- Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

3

CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to 4 Program Impact

The EPP did not provide evidence that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth. (component 4.1)

Standard 4.1 highlights how the PPM UPRAg prepared the completers to be successful in their employment. The following tables and charts will show the students' grades per Class for each Completer (4.1.1 Completer - Student Grades per Class). To protect the privacy of the teachers and students, names were not included. As references completers were named Completer 2, Completer 2, Completer 4, Completer 5, Completer 6, and Completer 7. The students were named by numbers. The data was obtained from a Christian Private School located in the northwest of Puerto Rico.

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

- How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?
- How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

- How are you monitoring and measuring progress?
- How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved

outcomes?

Leveraging data

- How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?
- How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)
- What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

- How does this effort complement existing initiatives?
- How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?
- Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?
- How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

- How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?
- If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?
- If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

- Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

4

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) related to 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
There was limited evidence that the provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tests innovations, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. (component 5.3)

In order to analyze the operation of the quality assurance system for the EPP, a needs study has been carried out to determine the evaluation of the educational practices, both of the program and of the students. Among the needs investigated is identification of the demographic data of each Clinical Experience Center, so that the information is updated. The most relevant aspects around the educational experience with the Teacher Candidate to be considered are identifying the strengths of the EPP and areas of opportunity of the program.

Regarding demographic data, it was found that 100% of Clinical Educators are from the public education system and are using the online teaching modality.

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

- How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?
- How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

- How are you monitoring and measuring progress?
- How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

- How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?
- How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)

- What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

- How does this effort complement existing initiatives?
- How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?
- Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?
- How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

- How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?
- If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?
- If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

- Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

5

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) related to 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
The EPP provided limited evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement in decision making, program evaluation and selection, and implementation of changes for improvement. (component 5.5)

The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. This evidence demonstrates that the EPP satisfies all CAEP standards.

The provider continuously monitors and improves the quality of its programs. The mission of UPRAg is to "provide educational alternatives within the arts, sciences, and technologies that respond to the economic, social, and cultural needs of Puerto Rico, particularly those of the Northwestern part of the Island. The knowledge base of the UPRAg EPP comes from cognitive, constructive, and humanistic theories that guide field experiences and the UPRAg student profile. Six key elements (knowledge of discipline and pedagogy, ethics, technology, assessment, lifelong learning, and diversity) shape the theoretical framework that guides the development of knowledge, skills and dispositions infused through the EPP-developed field and clinical experience, community service, and interdisciplinary and research experiences.

Our quality assurance program is designed to help us inform, modify, evaluate, and monitor the EPP's operational effectiveness.

Standard 1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP Staff and EPP Directors work together to continually analyze candidates' achievements every semester. The primary tool that we use for that purpose is candidate grades. With the data, we discuss and analyze the implications during faculty meetings. This data also informs how we analyze the creation and revision of academic programs and courses, such as, the implementation of new learning strategies.

Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Due to the unique nature of our pedagogical context (Puerto Rico), the EPP staff work together to translate instruments and evidence to both English and Spanish. These translations begin in May but continue as more information is received. Having everything in two languages facilitates the preparation of reports in a way that is meaningful to stakeholders, candidates, and completers.

The EPP currently focused on obtaining evidence of technology-based collaborations. The clinical supervisor, along with the EPP director of the English program, annually revise an Electronic Instructional Module. This module assures that candidates know, understand, and use the major theories and research related to the structure and acquisition of language to help English Language Learners develop language and literacy and achieve in the content areas. They also address the feedback received in the National Recognition Report for TESOL accreditation.

Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The Institutional Recruitment committee works to set up a recruitment plan. New improvements begin to be implemented in the fall semester. Recruitment efforts ramp up during the Spring semester as students finish their high school diplomas and complete the Collage Board. The evidence that demonstrates success in this area can be seen in the admission and transfer rates. The committee overseas the areas for improvement and are in charge of making final decisions.

Standard 4. Program Impact

The EPP staff and directors work together in the gathering of data that reflects the completer's impact on P-12 student learning. Measures are reviewed and analyzed every two years to assure that the program is continuously improving. We have compiled survey results that demonstrate how employers view completers, how completers view the program, and how P-12 students view the completers. We have also considered P-12 grades and will use standardized exam results in the future. This stream of information helps us to inform our decision making.

Standard 5. Provided Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity

The EPP staff work together upon the creation and revision of instruments to align evidence to CAEP Guiding Principles. Every two years they develop a benchmark report. These factors ensure that the program is taking measures to improve and facilitate the decision-making process.

Disaggregation of Data by Licensure Data

The EPP's Quality Assurance System supports the disaggregation of data by licensure area and other dimensions. In the chart below, the single-assessment level pass rate is provided for each academic year under consideration.

The data shows that the EPP has been extremely effective in preparing completers to pass the licensure examinations. The Institutional Pass Rate (IPR) has been favorable for all three academic years under consideration.

The data for 2017-2018 is irregular because that was the year the island was affected by Hurricane Maria. Widespread and long-term power outages affected the way that many institutions across the island operated. The annual report published by the PCMAS board was different for this year. PCMAS General data for the EPP were omitted entirely from the report that we received. Despite these unforeseen challenges, our candidates and completers scored favorably in all areas as presented in the table.

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?

How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

How are you monitoring and measuring progress?

How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?

How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)

What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

How does this effort complement existing initiatives?

How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?

Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?

How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?

If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

6

CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to **5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**
The EPP does not have an articulated quality assurance system to collect valid data from multiple measures that monitors candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. (component 5.1)

The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress,

completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. This evidence demonstrates that the EPP satisfies all CAEP standards. The provider continuously monitors and improves the quality of its programs. The mission of UPRAg is to "provide educational alternatives within the arts, sciences, and technologies that respond to the economic, social, and cultural needs of Puerto Rico, particularly those of the Northwestern part of the Island. The knowledge base of the UPRAg EPP comes from cognitive, constructive, and humanistic theories that guide field experiences and the UPRAg student profile. Six key elements (knowledge of discipline and pedagogy, ethics, technology, assessment, lifelong learning, and diversity) shape the theoretical framework that guides the development of knowledge, skills and dispositions infused through the EPP-developed field and clinical experience, community service, and interdisciplinary and research experiences.

Our quality assurance program is designed to help us inform, modify, evaluate, and monitor the EPP's operational effectiveness.

Standard 1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge

The EPP Staff and EPP Directors work together to continually analyze candidates' achievements every semester. The primary tool that we use for that purpose is candidate grades. With the data, we discuss and analyze the implications during faculty meetings. This data also informs how we analyze the creation and revision of academic programs and courses, such as, the implementation of new learning strategies.

Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

Due to the unique nature of our pedagogical context (Puerto Rico), the EPP staff work together to translate instruments and evidence to both English and Spanish. These translations begin in May but continue as more information is received. Having everything in two languages facilitates the preparation of reports in a way that is meaningful to stakeholders, candidates, and completers.

The EPP currently focused on obtaining evidence of technology-based collaborations. The clinical supervisor, along with the EPP director of the English program, annually revise an Electronic Instructional Module. This module assures that candidates know, understand, and use the major theories and research related to the structure and acquisition of language to help English Language Learners develop language and literacy and achieve in the content areas. They also address the feedback received in the National Recognition Report for TESOL accreditation.

Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The Institutional Recruitment committee works to set up a recruitment plan. New improvements begin to be implemented in the fall semester. Recruitment efforts ramp up during the Spring semester as students finish their high school diplomas and complete the College Board. The evidence that demonstrates success in this area can be seen in the admission and transfer rates. The committee oversees the areas for improvement and is in charge of making final decisions.

Standard 4. Program Impact

The EPP staff and directors work together in the gathering of data that reflects the completer's impact on P-12 student learning. Measures are reviewed and analyzed every two years to assure that the program is continuously improving. We have compiled survey results that demonstrate how employers view completers, how completers view the program, and how P-12 students view the completers. We have also considered P-12 grades and will use standardized exam results in the future. This stream of information helps us to inform our decision-making.

Standard 5. Provided Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

The EPP staff work together upon the creation and revision of instruments to align evidence to CAEP Guiding Principles. Every two years they develop a benchmark report. These factors ensure that the program is taking measures to improve and facilitate the decision-making process.

Disaggregation of Data by Licensure Data

The EPP's Quality Assurance System supports the disaggregation of data by licensure area and other dimensions. In the chart below, the single-assessment level pass rate is provided for each academic year under consideration (5.1.1).

The data shows that the EPP has been extremely effective in preparing completers to pass the licensure examinations. The Institutional Pass Rate (IPR) has been favorable for all three academic years under consideration.

The data for 2017-2018 is irregular because that was the year the island was affected by Hurricane Maria. Widespread and long-term power outages affected the way that many institutions across the island operated. The annual report published by the PCMAS board was different for this year. PCMAS General data for the EPP were omitted entirely from the report that we received. Despite these unforeseen challenges, our candidates and completers scored favorably in all areas as presented in the table.

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

- How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?
- How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

- How are you monitoring and measuring progress?
- How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

- How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?
- How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)
- What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

- How does this effort complement existing initiatives?
- How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?
- Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?
- How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

- How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?
- If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?
- If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

- Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

7

CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP does not have evidence that the quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, cumulative and actionable measures that produces empirical evidence of data that are valid and consistent. (component 5.2)

UPRAG's EPP quality assurance system uses various assessment instruments to gather data as evidence to meet CAEP's standard. These meet the expectations for evidence quality. For example, the completers teaching evaluation instrument data used for the pilot study was gathered from an assessment instrument used by the partnership school. The partnership school is an accredited institution that regularly uses the Teacher Teaching Evaluation Observation instrument to assess teacher performance in the classroom. The instrument assesses teachers' effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions when teaching and their effect on student's learning and development. They have been using this instrument, with needed modifications having been made, for 10 years. It was first created by two educational specialists with doctoral degrees in education. It was last revised three years ago. The criteria on the instrument are aligned to the specifications of teacher's duties as stipulated by Puerto Rico's Department of Education. To assure the instrument's data validity, during this pilot phase, the partnership school's Teacher Evaluation Instrument criteria were correlated to the (Candidate's) Student Teaching Evaluation used in UPRAG's EPP. The construct validity for the Teacher Evaluation Instrument has been established because the instrument criteria is focused on assessing teachers' effective use of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. When the components in the UPRAG's (Candidate's) Student Teaching Evaluation were correlated to the criteria in the partnership school Teacher Teaching Evaluation, the criteria aligned (see instrument, data analysis and correlation chart in attachments) thus demonstrating that the same areas were being evaluated in both instruments. The data obtained would be valid for UPRAG's EPP assessment purposes in demonstrating completer's effectiveness in applying the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions, that the preparation experiences at UPRAG's EPP were designed to achieve, in the classroom for effective student learning and development.

The data gathered from the Teacher Evaluation Instrument has also proven to be reliable since the instrument has been used regularly and the data gathered has allowed the partnership school to consistently implement changes for improvement based on the data. Additionally, the data will be useful for UPRAG's EPP to assess completers effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the teaching-learning process. This in turn allows the EPP to make decisions on any changes or improvements necessary to assure the programs and its completers' quality. This data will be collected each semester.

In the next phase of the completer's effectiveness study, the EPP will use a teacher teaching evaluation instrument, created with the partnership school's feedback and other stakeholders, based on the EPP's Candidate's Teaching Evaluation (used in clinical practice) and the Danielson Framework Teacher Observation Rubric, which proved to be a valid and reliable instrument in teacher evaluation projects like the MET study. EPP faculty and partnership school members will be trained to use the instrument to observe completers as free as possible of bias and assure inter-rater reliability. This data will be correlated with value-added measures such as the student's achievement scores and learning goals.

The Student Perception Survey (see instrument is attachments) was prepared for use during the next phase case studies of completers. The instrument focuses on gathering data demonstrating how students perceive the teachers' (EPP completers) effectiveness in using their professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help them advance academically. The construct validity of the Student Perception Survey was checked against the EPP's Conceptual Frameworks list of proficiencies for candidates that are developed throughout the program, CAEP's standards and guidelines, and the PRDE professional standards. These were evaluated by faculty members and stakeholders and their recommendations were incorporated. Test pilots using this instrument will be conducted in the next phase. This will allow the EPP to further assure the instrument's validity and reliability. Specifically, concurrent validity, predictive validity, face validity, test-retest reliability, and internal consistency reliability.

The Employer Satisfaction Survey was used to gather data on employers' level of satisfaction with completers performance in the classroom and their application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to impact k-12 students. The instrument assesses five expected competencies: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, Dispositions, Professional Responsibility, Interpersonal Relations within Schools Community and Completers Impact on P-12 Student Learning. The data was presented, analyzed, and compared to completers' teaching clinical practice data. Both data correlated (see instruments and data analysis in SSR, April 2018 attachments). Thus, the construct validity and concurrent validity were ascertained. The data analysis allowed the EPP to predict that completers will prove effective in the classroom, thus ascertaining predictive validity. Additionally, the instrument's reliability was shown in the fact that the results were consistent with the use of the instrument by different employers. In the next phase, test-retest reliability will be investigated when the Employer Satisfaction Survey is once again used by the employers to assess the same completers.

Completer's Satisfaction Survey

The Completer's Satisfaction Survey (previously titled Alumni Satisfaction Survey) is administered to those finishing the program. The instrument includes 17 statements that assess completers satisfaction with their preparation including course quality (item 1); development of profes

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

- How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?
- How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

- How are you monitoring and measuring progress?
- How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

- How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?
- How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)
- What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

- How does this effort complement existing initiatives?
- How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?
- Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?
- How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

- How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?
- If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?
- If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

- Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to

report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

8

CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to **5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

There are no measures of completer impact that are externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, or acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future directions. (component 5.4)

UPRAG's EPP includes Elementary Education, Elementary Education of English with Multimedia Technology, and Secondary Education of English with Multimedia Technology. The program has initiated a pilot study to demonstrate the completers' teaching effectiveness. A partnership was established with a school with completers working at both the elementary and secondary levels. This partnership is undergoing the initial phase of assessing the impact of its completers concerning P-12 student growth through an instrument of observation: Teacher Teaching Evaluation Observation and student's grades for one semester. EPP's Pilot Study is an ongoing design established as a structure with a systematic approach for data collection, analysis, and working to develop a routine for regular data collection and analysis. Findings will be used for decision-making, program growth, improvement, and dissemination. To summarize, findings from the data gathered demonstrated the following completers' success rates in applying professional knowledge throughout their teaching process: competence #1 and #2 (area IV), completers demonstrated an average of 96% effectivity. Completers demonstrated an average of 95% effectivity for competence #5 (area VI). Regarding skill development, a cross-cutting theme considered that a core area of the program is technology. Technology usage and integration are intended to be incorporated throughout the duration of the undergraduate studies with the purpose of its implementation once the completers teach their own courses. Technology use and integration skills are exhibited in Areas VII: Online Grading System Usage, IX: Course Information, and XII: Technology Tools, obtaining a 98% average. Completers model clarity of expression and communication in the L1 & L2 in language arts measuring a 96% as a general average in the following observed areas: I: Personal Qualities, II: Classroom Management, III: Professional Skill, V: Instructional Techniques, VI: Evaluation and Assessment, XI: Course Information. UPRAG EPP completers measured 87% in area III: Planning. Planning instruction, preparation of activities, selection of appropriate level resources are established as an area for improvement. UPRAG EPP Assessment 3 is the instrument used for evaluating Student Teaching in Clinical Practice. The guidelines and rubric are currently under revision by a Committee created for document and material revision composed by Clinical Practice Supervisors and Professors teaching Methodology and Seminar courses. In Area VI: Evaluation and Assessment completers obtained a 95%. UPRAG EPP establishes clear standards for developing skills to evaluate and assess student's performance and the creation of teaching techniques and their application. As a benchmark, the University of Puerto Rico in Ponce (south region of the island) has an Educator Preparation Program. This exemplary program has been consistent in state licensure (PCMAS) with a 95% for years 2017-2018. The score for the three-year period reflects 3% exceeding the passing rate of the total number of institutions in Puerto Rico. Moreover, 100% of Completers' Employers expressed agreeing and strongly agreeing with 12 statements related to content knowledge area, critical, creative thinking and research skills, language and communication skills with students, family, and community members, knowledge of student and learning process, management of education environment, effective planning and teaching, ethics, professional commitment, effective use of resources and information technology, assessment techniques, and respect for diversity. (Employer Satisfaction Survey, UPRP EPP Website, 2018) Regarding state licensure, UPRAG EPP has obtained an 85% passing rate for 2015-2016, a 95% for 2016 & 2017, (2017-2018 no data available), starting at 5% lower than UPRP EEP, but leveling with a similar percentage of passing rate from the benchmarked institution and state institutional levels. Performance is similar and favorable in comparison to the benchmark. Regarding Licensure in the Specialization Area (Teaching of English Language), the average percentage obtained was 95 from 2015 to 2019, while the state average for those years is 77%. The trend or pattern exhibited by the candidates shows a 10% of increase in General PCMAS and a 5% in the Specialization Area. From UPRAG EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey has 27 criteria that are subdivided into five competencies. These reflect candidate proficiencies, competencies, and expected indicators of the profession. The five competencies are the following: Pedagogical Capacity, Dispositions, Responsibilities in the Performance of the Job Duties, Interpersonal Relations with School Community, and Impact on P-12 Student Learning. An emphasis is given to assess candidates' impact on students' learning. Considering the innate characteristic of this Case Study being a pilot, this instrument will be administered for the second and third time with 2021 and 2022 alumni. Three sets of data will be analyzed studying the standard deviation from the resulting data with the purpose of identifying if the instrument measures consistently and what it was originally intended to measure. Following administration of the instrument and its data compilation, a culture of revision is being promoted among faculty. (Geerinck, A., 2019) <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216065> Continued in evidence 5.4.1

a. Please consider the following prompts as you continue to address deficiencies cited in relation to CAEP standards.

Stakeholder engagement

- How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?
- How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?
-

How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

- How are you monitoring and measuring progress?
- How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

- How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?
- How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)
- What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

- How does this effort complement existing initiatives?
- How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?
- Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?
- How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

- How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?
- If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?
- If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

- Specify:

The EPP has discussed how it is currently working to address the AFI. It will continue to report findings in this area and will ultimately report them during its next accreditation review.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Overview: In this section of the EPP Annual Report, EPPs no longer respond by accreditation pathway. Instead of responding to pathway requirements, all providers have an opportunity to share continuous improvement efforts and processes relating to the CAEP Standards.

Why is this section important? The prompts in Section 6 are aligned with Standard 5 and Component 5.3, allowing providers to use the EPP Annual Report to catalog data and narrative over time in a way that prepares the provider to respond to Component 5.3 in the self-study report. Component 5.3 provides a chance for EPPs to put data related to the rest of CAEP's Standards to work to systematically change programs to improve outcomes for candidates and ultimately the P-12 students they will serve. Not only is the application of appropriate data to make and monitor informed changes a requirement of CAEP's Standards, but it is also a regular behavior and value of high-performing organizations; noticeably, the Baldrige Criteria and improvement science research inspired Standard 5.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

- ✓ Quality assurance systems and data-informed continuous improvement are essential, foundational requirements for CAEP accreditation. This section instantiates an ongoing culture of evidence, while allowing CAEP to see some of the work done between accreditation cycles. Further EPP Annual Report Reviewers identify models of data-informed improvement so that CAEP may further collaborate with the field to spread continuous improvement initiatives.

General organizational reflections prompts to guide your quality assurance and continuous improvement efforts (Created by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching explicitly for EPP use in CAEP's Standard 5):

In the spirit of CAEP Standard 5, iteratively reflect on what are you trying, how are you inquiring about your change efforts, what have you learned, and what are you trying next?

- As you examine the outcomes you currently achieve (i.e., data on the first four standards), and identify gaps between current results and established standards, why is it that these results continue to occur?

- How do you understand the problem(s) you need to solve? And what inquiries have you engaged in to help clarify this problem analysis (e.g., data analyses that might inform sources of variation in performance; in-depth interviews with current participants and recent graduates a.k.a. user-centered empathy inquiries)?
- Based on your systematic problem analysis, what is your working theory of improvement? (e.g., what are the three to five places in your instructional system that are your high leverage improvement targets/drivers and what drivers (or areas for intervention) are thought to lead to improvements within them?)
- How has this working theory been tested? What changes have you tried and why did you focus here (looking for connection to relevant research evidence and working theory of improvement)? How do you (will you?) know if these changes are an improvement?
- More generally, as you cycle through your processes of continuous improvement (iteratively refining your theories based on the results of the changes made) what are you learning about your instructional system, and how has this helped you to refine your working theory of improvement?

Remember we often learn most from our failures. So, if relevant, what perhaps might you have tried, found evidence that it did not work as you intended, and what did you learn from this about what to try next?

1. [6.1] Please consider the following prompts

Stakeholder engagement

How are you engaging stakeholders (**P-12 partners, academic and clinical faculty, staff, administrators, community members, candidates, and completers**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly P-12 partners**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly a coalition of EPP faculty - academic and clinical -, staff, and administrators**) in this work?

How are you engaging stakeholders (**particularly candidates and completers**) in this work?

How are these data shared with stakeholders?

Progress monitoring

How are you monitoring and measuring progress?

How do you/will you know the degree to which these changes result in improved outcomes?

Leveraging data

How are you leveraging existing data sources to inform your effort(s)?

How can the actionability of data be improved? (Actionable: Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.)

What benchmarks or comparisons can you use to gauge your progress and add context?

Integration/Triangulation

How does this effort complement existing initiatives?

How do these data work with other information and assessment results in your quality assurance system?

Do you see any opportunities for data triangulation/convergence in your quality assurance system?

How are you using these data for program improvement?

Assessment Quality

How does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

If you made modifications to a proprietary assessment, how have you re-evaluated validity?

If you made a change to an EPP-created assessment, how does your assessment align with the sufficient-level criteria on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments?

Other

Specify:
The EPP has discussed its current efforts towards continuous improvement.

- a. Further clarification (optional)

2. Did the EPP indicate the willingness to share highlights, new initiative, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP communications?

- Yes No

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Overview: : The report preparer checks the box to affirm that they are authorized to complete the report by the and enters their name, position, phone number, and email address. The report preparer checks the box to acknowledge their understanding of the CAEP Policies pertaining to the EPP Annual Report.

Why is this section important? The final section of the report requests information on the report preparer and asks the preparer to affirm that he or she is authorized to complete the EPP Annual Report and demonstrate that he or she understands and agrees to CAEP's policy on data ownership, annual reporting, and misleading or incorrect statements.

Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?

✓ As submission of the EPP Annual Report is a condition of maintaining current accreditation or eligibility status, collecting the authorization of the preparer is needed to officially represent the EPP, as well as protect the EPP and CAEP. This section must be completed before the EPP Annual Report is officially submitted. CAEP visits this information if any questions of authenticity arise or to aid in contacting the EPP, if needed.

Comment:

Authorized.